

SENATE DEFEATS A MOVE TO DELAY SENTINEL SYSTEM

Votes \$227-Million to Start
Deployment of Missiles
as a Nuclear Defense

By JOHN W. FINNEY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 24 —

The Senate, responding to Administration pleas on the need to develop a defense against Chinese and Soviet nuclear threats, defeated today a move to postpone deployment of the Sentinel missile defense system.

By a 52-to-34 vote, the Senate rejected a motion to eliminate \$227-million from a military construction authorization bill to start the \$5.5-billion Sentinel system.

The motion, a direct challenge to Administration defense policy, was offered by a bipartisan coalition headed by Senators John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, and Philip A. Hart, Democrat of Michigan.

Absenteeism Noted

In its challenge, the coalition was weakened by absenteeism. Several Senators who had been expected to vote for the motion stayed away from the Senate floor because of apparent political concern over seeming to vote against the defense of the American people against a missile attack.

It was this concern that the Administration and its supporters in the Senate played on in swinging what had been expected to be a close vote.

Reflecting past arguments of the Defense Department, leaders of the coalition argued that it was impossible to build an effective defense against a large-scale missile attack. In response, Administration supporters argued that any system that would save American lives was "a sound investment."

In defeat, however, the coalition, by its challenge, appeared to have altered the Administration's basic premises, both politically and strategically, in proceeding with an antiballistic missile system.

Stress Put on Soviet

The Administration, which originally advanced the Sentinel system as a defense against the emerging Chinese missile threat, was driven to justify the step as a defensive move against the Soviet Union.

In announcing the Sentinel deployment decision last fall, the Administration explained that the system was designed to provide a "light" defense against a small-scale missile attack, such as Communist China might be capable of launching in the mid nineteen-seventies.

But as the challenge devel-

Continued on Page 3, Column 5

SENATE DEFEATS SENTINEL DELAY

Continued From Page 1, Col. 6

oped in the Senate, the Administration and its Senate supporters more and more shifted to the argument that the Sentinel system could also protect Minutemen missiles and save American lives against a large-scale Soviet attack.

In the process of this shift in rationale, the Administration, which initially contended there were only "marginal" reasons for proceeding with an anti-Chinese system, began stressing that an ABM system

Roll-Call Vote in Senate On Missile System Fund

WASHINGTON, June 24 (AP)

—Following is the roll-call vote by which the Senate defeated today the amendment of Senators John Sherman Cooper and Philip A. Hart to delete \$227-million for construction of an antiballistic missile system from a military authorization bill:

FOR THE AMENDMENT—34

Democrats—22

Burdick (N.D.)	MoMrse (Ore.)
Clark (Pa.)	Moss (Utah)
Ellender (La.)	Muskie (Me.)
Gore (Tenn.)	Nelson (Wis.)
Hart (Mich.)	Pell (R.I.)
Lausche (Ohio)	Proxmire (Wis.)
Mansfield (Mont.)	Randolph (W.Va.)
McCarthy (Minn.)	Symington (Mo.)
McGovern (S.D.)	Tydings (Md.)
Metcalf (Mont.)	Williams (N.J.)
Mondale (Minn.)	Youngs (Ohio)

Republicans—12

Aiken (Vt.)	Morton (Ky.)
Brooks (Mass.)	Percy (Ill.)
Case (N.J.)	Proby (Vt.)
Cooper (Ky.)	Scott (Pa.)
Hatfield (Ore.)	Smith (Me.)
Javits (N.Y.)	Williams (Del.)

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT—52

Democrats—29

Anderson (N.M.)	Inouye (Hawaii)
Bayh (Ind.)	Jackson (Wash.)
Bible (Nev.)	Jordan (N.C.)
Brewster (Md.)	Long (La.)
Byrd (Va.)	Magnuson (Wash.)
Byrd (W.Va.)	McClellan (Ark.)
Cannon (Nev.)	McGee (Wyo.)
Dodd (Conn.)	Pastore (R.I.)
Eastland (Miss.)	Russell (Ga.)
Ervin (N.C.)	Smathers (Fla.)
Harris (Okla.)	Sparkman (Ala.)
Hayden (Ariz.)	Spong (Va.)
Hill (Ala.)	Stennis (Miss.)
Holland (Fla.)	Talmadge (Ga.)
Hollins (S.C.)	

Republicans—23

Allott (Colo.)	Hansen (Wyo.)
Baker (Tenn.)	Hickenlooper (Iowa)
Bennett (Utah)	Jordan (Idaho)
Boggs (Del.)	Kuchell (Calif.)
Carlson (Kan.)	Miller (Iowa)
Cotton (N.H.)	Mundt (S.D.)
Curtis (Neb.)	Murphy (Calif.)
Dirksen (Ill.)	Pearson (Kan.)
Dominick (Colo.)	Thurmond (S.C.)
Fannin (Ariz.)	Tower (Tex.)
Fong (Hawaii)	Young (N.D.)
Griffin (Mich.)	

Not voting but announced as paired on the amendment (pairs are used to denote opposition positions of Senators when one or both are absent): Ribicoff (D-Conn.) for and McIntyre (D-Vt.) against; Hartke (D-Ind.) for and Yarbrough (D-Tex.) against; Gruening (D-Alaska) for and Monroney (D-Okla.) against; Church (D-Idaho) for and Hruska (R-Neb.) against.